

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims. Claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Those rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)

Claims 1-5, 8-14, and 17-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Varadarajan (Suba Varadarajan, Virtual Local Area Networks, August 14, 1997, pages 1-14).

Before discussing the cited references, however, a brief review of the Applicant's disclosure may be helpful without limiting the claims. The Applicant's disclosure is directed to a switch for receiving and forwarding data packets. Referring to Fig. 3, the switch includes a translator 300 and a filtering database 302. The translator 300 provides a translated VLAN identifier (translated VID) 310 for a VLAN identifier (VID) 306 associated with a data packet received by the switch. The filtering database 302 has a static entry 500 and a dynamic entry 502, each storing associations between translated VIDs and forwarding decisions. By storing translated VIDs in the static and dynamic entries, instead of simply storing un-translated VIDs in the static entry and VLAN groups in the dynamic entry, the filtering database 302 can be searched for a forwarding decision in a single search operation. (*See*, Applicant's Specification, page 12, line 1 through page 13, line 23.)

Turning to the cited references, Varadarajan discusses various uses of Virtual Local Area Networks (VLANs), and their functionality in accordance with the IEEE 802.1Q standard. It should be noted that publication date of Varadarajan is believed not to be August 14, 1997 but rather February 7, 2000 as indicated at the weblink [http://www.cse.wustl.edu/~jain/cis788-97/ftp/virtual\\_lans.pdf](http://www.cse.wustl.edu/~jain/cis788-97/ftp/virtual_lans.pdf), and as a cited reference in U.S. Patent No. 6,577,412. Applicant may be able to swear behind Varadarajan; however, such action is not believed to be necessary since the claims of the present application are distinguishable from Varadarajan as discussed below. While Varadarajan discusses the tagging of frames with VIDs (*see*, Varadarajan, pages 11-13,) Varadarajan does not disclose providing a translated VID. Therefore, Varadarajan does not

teach or suggest *“forwarding logic which provides a translated identifier for the virtual LAN identifier”* as claimed in independent Claim 1.

Furthermore, Varadarajan does not disclose providing a forwarding decision in a single search of the filtering database. The filtering database of Varadarajan operates in accordance with the IEEE 802.1Q standard, and as stated on page 5, “the bridge determines where the data is to go next based on normal LAN operations.” Varadarajan discusses storing static and dynamic entries in a filtering database (*see* Varadarajan pages 9-10.) Normally, a filtering database with both static and dynamic entries requires two searches of the database; a first search of the static entry, and a second search of the dynamic entry. Therefore, Varadarajan does not teach or suggest *“a filtering database that provides a forward vector for the translated identifier from a single search of the filtering database”* as claimed in independent Claim 1.

For the reasons discussed above, Claim 1 should be found in allowable condition. Independent Claim 10 is similar to Claim 1 and should be found in allowable condition for the same reasons as discussed above for independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 8-9, 11-14, and 17-18 are directly or indirectly dependent on independent Claims 1 and 10 and thus are novel over the cited art for at least the same reasons as discussed above for independent Claims 1 and 10. As such, the 35 U.S.C. 102(a) rejections of Claims 1-5, 8-14, and 17-18 are believed to be overcome, and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 6-7 and 15-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Varadarajan in view of Paul (Devashish Paul, Ternary DRAM CAM: Now and Future, May 1, 2000, pages 1-2).

Paul does not overcome the limitations of Varadarajan as discussed above. Dependent Claims 6-7 and 15-16 are directly or indirectly dependent on independent Claims 1 and 10 and thus are novel over the cited art for at least the same reasons as discussed above for independent Claims 1 and 10.

Therefore, separately or in combination, Varadarajan and Paul do not teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention. Thus, none of the cited art alone or in combination makes

obvious the Applicants' claimed switch for receiving and forwarding data packets. As such, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of Claims 6-7 and 15-16 are believed to be overcome.

Accordingly, the present invention as claimed is not believed to be anticipated or made obvious from the cited or prior art. Removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and acceptance of Claims 1-18 is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

James M. Smith

Registration No. 28,043

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: 4/11/7